

During the interview, the applicant pointed out that although Nielsen and Lohman disclose a memory controller, a graphics controller, and a cache, neither Nielsen nor Lohman discloses or suggests a memory controller hub having a cache that is adapted both to store addresses of locations in physical memory available to an external graphics controller coupled to the memory controller hub for storing graphics data and to store addresses of locations in physical memory available to an internal graphics controller for storing graphics data. The Examiner agreed with the applicant and indicated that claims 1 and 7 appeared to be patentable, but that he would do an additional prior art search with respect to those claims.

Independent claim 13 claims a method of storing addresses of locations in physical memory in a memory controller hub cache. The method comprises "determining whether the memory controller hub is operably coupled to an external graphics controller or whether the memory controller hub performs graphics operations on data using an internal graphics subsystem." During the interview, the applicant pointed out that neither Nielson nor Lohman discloses or suggests the claimed method, or the steps thereof. The Examiner agreed and indicated that he would allow the claim 13.

7. As per claims 2-3 and 8-9 ...

8. Claims 4-6, 10-12 and 14-16 ...

The dependent claims are patentable for at least some of the same reasons as the claims from which they depend.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicants amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP §706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Applicant : Bryan R. White
Serial No. : 09/676,844
Filed : September 29, 2000
Page : 4 of 4

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-165001 / P8249

During the interview, the applicant pointed out the prior amendment was made purely for stylistic reasons and was not for reasons of patentability. The amendment did not change the scope of the claims, and a new ground of rejection was not required by the amendment. The applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication in the interview that the finality of the rejection would be withdrawn because of this.

No fees are believed to be due at this time. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 10559-165001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

8/12/04



Mark R.W. Bellermann
Reg. No. 47,419

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331